29th November 1928]

prepared after consulting in the prescribed manner the owners of lands and buildings in the area affected as required by section 11 of the Town-Planning Act;

(b) whether a town-planning scheme of block No. 10 in the municipal area of Mangalore was prepared and sanctioned after consulting the owners of lands and buildings concerned in the area affected, and if so, how;

(c) whether it is a fact that none of the owners were really consulted;

(d) what the main purposes of the scheme are, how they are to be carried out and at what cost approximately; and

(e) how the scheme referred to is to be financed and how the financial propositions have been worked out?

A.—(a) Attention of the hon. Member is invited to sections 9 and 10 of the Madras Town-Planning Act, 1920, which require that resolutions either to make or to adopt a scheme shall be published by notification for criticism.

(b) The block No. 10 Market Ward Town-planning scheme was called for by Government under section 12 of the Madras Town-Planning Act, and a notification therefor was published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*. No written objections or suggestions were submitted by the Council as required by section 14 (2) of the Act along with the draft scheme. The Government presumed that there were no objections or suggestions and accorded sanction.

(c) The Government have no information.

(d) & (e) A copy of G.O. No. 1304, P.H., dated 26th June 1928, which contains the information is placed on the table.[a]

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"May I enquire, Sir, whether apart from the notice required under section 9 or 10 of the Town-Planning Act, under section 11 persons affected were consulted?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"That is asking for an opinion."

Civil Justice

Construction of District Court buildings at Nellore.

849 Q.—Mr. C. VENKATARANGAM NAYUDU : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have repeatedly received representations from the District Judge of Nellore explaining the desirability of constructing new buildings on a suitable site for all the courts in the town;

(b) whether proposals have been received for the acquisition of a site in Darganiet for the construction of the court buildings; and

(c) what action has been taken thereon?

A.—(a) The Government are aware that the District Judge, Nellore, has made certain representations on the subject.

(b) & (c) The proposal for the acquisition of a site had to be dropped as such acquisition would have cost much more than the site by itself was worth owing to the existence on it of a building which would be of no use to the Judicial Department.

[a] Printed as Appendix VI on pages 528-531 infra

[29th November 1928

Mr. MUHAMMAD KHADIR MOHIDIN SAHIB :—"In view of the anxiety of the litigant public to have all the courts in one place, will the Government be pleased to state whether they would acquire the site mentioned or any other site they may think best ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"We will not acquire the site in question, but with regard to the other point whether the Government will acquire any other site, I want notice."

Accommodation for the Bar room of the District Court at Mangalore.

*850 Q.—Mr. K. R. KARANT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) in what stage the question of providing additional accommodation for the Bar room of the District Court at Mangalore is at present; and

(b) when it is proposed to start the work ?

A.—(a) & (b) The question is still under correspondence with the Executive Engineer and the District Judge, South Kanara.

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—"Will Government be pleased to expedite the matter ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I believe the matter is being expedited. Government have already sent reminders on the subject."

Opening of an additional sub-court at Mangalore.

*851 Q.—Mr. K. R. KARANT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether Government have come to any decision on the opening of an additional sub-court at Mangalore; and

(b) if not, why not?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have sanctioned the appointment of an Additional Sub-Judge to the Sub-Court, Mangalore, with effect from the 1st December 1928.

District Munsifs holding appointments in their own districts.

*852 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased—

(a) to place before the Council a statement showing the names of the District Munsifs in this Presidency who are holding their appointments in their native districts and the number of years each has been within the same district during the last ten years; and

(b) to state—

(i) whether there was a Government or High Court Standing Order that no District Munsif should as a rule be appointed within his own district;

(ii) whether the practice of appointing District Munsifs within their own districts has been found by the Government or the High Court to be satisfactory; and

(iii) whether any steps are contemplated by the Government or the High Court with a view to make appointments of District Munsifs as far away as possible from their own districts?